

StLA Data and Public Policy Questions
Working Paper 1 – Governance
March, 2001

- I Purpose of this Paper
 - II State Library Governance - One of Three Recurring Political Issues
 - III The January 2001 New York State Library Proposal Advanced by the Governor
In the 2001-2002 Executive Budget
 - IV What Questions Does the Proposal Raise?
 - V What do the NCES StLA Data Tell Us? (*State Library Agencies, Fiscal Year
1999, ((E.D. Tabs, September 2000)*
 - A. About Library Resources and Services
 - B. Electronic Development and Access to Resources
 - C. Library Development and Library Services for All
 - D. Income and Expenditures
 - E. Governance
 - VI Questions for StLA Steering Committee Discussion
(A List of data tables appears at the end of the paper)
-

I. Purpose

This paper is intended to provide information for the State Library Agency (StLA) Survey Steering Committee in its series of discussions on the usefulness of the StLA data for public policy research. As a case study, the information in this paper may also be useful to people in New York State as they discuss the Governor's proposal to change the governance of the New York State Library. However, this paper is **not intended** to advise New York State decision makers.

The StLA Steering Committee's discussion of this paper follows a December 2000 consideration of a paper entitled *StLA Data and Public Policy Questions*.

II. State Library Governance: One of Three Recurring Political Issues

The following is excerpted from the December 2000 StLA Steering Committee discussion paper, *StLA Data and Public Policy Questions*. This excerpt was preceded in that paper by a discussion of assumptions, identification of two problems in earlier Steering Committee "policy question" discussion, and a brief account of the work of Eugene Barbach and other public policy experts.

"If one agrees with Barbach's points, it follows that the formation of a public policy question and developing a thesis for the policy study may also be political acts. This is borne out by experience: Political issues relating to state library agencies tend to recur in

different cycles, depending upon political and government developments. Three examples – governance, function and change, and finance:

“StLA governance – sporadic but usually keen controversy, emerging from state government “reform” or “consolidation” initiatives, and such other developments as:

- (1) constitutional conventions or when possibility of major constitutional change is contemplated;
- (2) instances where a strong board and a governor or cabinet member disagree;
- (3) cases of the StLA located within a larger agency, when over-riding political concern forces a redirection of the larger agency. [Some StLAs located within State Education Departments have fared badly as political developments have intensified priority on k-12 education at the expense of other statutory responsibilities of the Department.];
- (4) disillusionment with current administration of the StLA; or
- (5) when the “library community” in a state differs with the administration or policies of the StLA so strongly that it seeks a reorganization of the agency. ...”

III. The January 2001 New York State Library Proposal Advanced by the Governor in *the 2001-2002 Executive Budget*

The following is excerpted from the section of the *New York State Governor’s Proposed Budget* for the Education Department for the year 2001-02, as presented to the Legislature on January 16, 2001:

“Cultural Resources

“In 2001-02, Governor Pataki will again propose the creation of a new Office of Cultural Resources (OCR) to promote recognition and visibility of the important cultural programs administered by the State Museum, the State Library and the State Archives. Programs from the State Education Department (SED) would be transferred to the new OCR, which would:

- Provide overall leadership for developing the State’s cultural resources in partnership with local governments, non-profit organizations and the private sector;
- Use state-of-the-art technology to transform the State Museum into a more vibrant and attractive resource to showcase New York’s heritage; and
- Provide greater opportunities for the State Library and the State Archives to emerge as world-class information centers.

“The Office of Cultural Resources would be headed by a nine-member Board of Trustees appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate. The Board would provide the general oversight of the Office and would appoint an Executive Director, responsible for its day-to-day operations. Funding for the operations of OCR and related grant programs would be transferred from SED and budgeted under the Council on the Arts.” [p.____]

The use of the word “again” in the first line of this excerpt refers to the fact that the 2000-01 budget had proposed creation of an Office of Cultural Resources. The 2000-01 budget was adopted without creating the proposed Office, and the New York State Library

continued to be a part of the State Education Department and under the control of the New York State Board of Regents.

Because the 2000-01 budget document (published in January 2000) provided additional details on the proposal, the following is excerpted from that earlier budget document.

“To sharpen the focus of the Board of Regents on matters directly related to education and to streamline agency operations, the 2000-01 Executive Budget recommends the following organizational changes:

“—Programs related to cultural development and promotion – the State Library, the State Museum, the State Archives – will be reassigned to a new Office of Cultural Resources (OCR) and budgeted within the Council on the Arts. The 2000-01 Executive Budget reflects the implementation of this functional transfer by October 1, 2000 and provides for the related transfer of funds, facilities and staff....”

“COUNCIL ON THE ARTS MISSION”

“The primary responsibility for oversight and administration of the State’s artistic and cultural resources is assigned to three existing entities – the Council on the Arts, the Empire State Plaza Performing Arts Center Corporation and the New York State Theatre Institute – and a newly established Office of Cultural Resources. Working together, these agencies will expand access to the performing and fine arts, preserve the State’s cultural resources and promote great public awareness of New York’s rich cultural heritage.

“ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING”

“The Council on the Arts is headed by a Chair and Vice Chair and consists of 20 members nominated for five-year terms by the Governor with confirmation by the Senate. The Council’s staff, headed by an Executive Director, is organized into an Administrative Division and a Program Division, both in New York City. The latter has expertise in several major artistic disciplines (including dance, theatre and music) and provides advisory serves and financial assistance to the arts community of the State. During 2000-01, the Council on the Arts will have a workforce of 64 for the review, processing and administration of arts grants and loans to nonprofit organization...

“...To promote increased recognition and visibility of the important cultural programs administered by the State Museum, the State Library and the State Archives, a transfer of these functions from the State Education Department (SED) is recommended to establish a new entity – the Office of Cultural Resources (OCR) – the sole focus of which will be these cultural functions. The 2000-01 Executive Budget proposes to implement this functional transfer by October 1, 2000 and provides for the related transfer of funds, facilities and staff.

“A nine-member Board of Trustees will oversee this new office with members nominated for five-year terms by the Governor subject to Senate confirmation. The Chair of the Board will be designated by the Governor from among the Trustees. The office’s chief executive officer will be an Executive Director appointed by the Board.

“ Funds for OCR’S operations and programs will be transferred from SED’s Cultural Education Program and the Office of Management Services. When the realignment is complete, OCR will have a staff of approximately 465.”

IV. What Questions Does the Proposal Raise – Where are Answers – And How Does this Paper Present and Organize Data Related to Questions?

Policy questions raised by the Governor’s proposal might include:

- What are the current strengths and deficiencies in the New York State Library’s services, resources, electronic development, and financial support?
- Does the Governor’s proposal suggest a vision for the Library different from that at the present time?
- How does the New York State Library compare with other major state libraries?
- What are the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed change of governance? Or, What are the advantages of approving the proposal?

Various sources of information for considering such questions include:

- Information from the New York State Library website, and websites of state library agencies in other states;
- Legislation and legislative history on the State Library’s governance;
- Strategic plans, which may provide a basis for comparing visions, strategies, and resource projections;
- Professional studies, books, and articles about state library agencies;
- Opinion of political, education, professional and other leaders; and
- Validated statistical data available in National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) library reports.

The states used for comparison in Part V of this paper: This Working Paper uses data from the NCES Survey of State Library Agencies reports for 1999 and 1994. Generally, data in tables are from 12 states: California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Washington. These states were selected because they met one or both of two criteria: (1) they had total 1999 state income of \$40 million or more, and/or (2) they operate a library of 600,000 or more volumes. The twelve states, taken together, operate both strong and respected state libraries and forward looking library development programs.

California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania reported 1999 income of \$40 million or more from state sources. They, Connecticut, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Texas, Virginia, and Washington each operate a library of 600,000 volumes or more. (Massachusetts had 1999 state income of \$47 million for financial aid to libraries and \$1.1 million for state agency operation and administration but is not included because it

does not operate a library for “walk in” service. Most of Massachusetts’s state and Federal income is intended for state aid to libraries and library development functions.

Another set of states used for comparison in Section E of this Paper provides key information on seven states which are located in “Cultural Departments” (the names of these departments vary): Louisiana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, and South Dakota. They did not meet the income and library collection criteria for the larger group.

The organization of information in Part V of this Paper: Sections of the next Part of this paper generally include the following elements: (1) A brief statement about the significance of the section; (2) An excerpt from the “Highlights” section of the FY 1999 NCES report on State Library Agencies to provide a national view; (3) “bullets” summarizing key information; and (4) tables providing information.

V. What Do the NCES StLA Data Tell Us?

(V.) Part A -- What Do the NCES StLA Data Tell Us About Library Resources and Information Services?

Collections

Most StLAs have library collections that are important information sources for state government workers, interlibrary loan, and for library users who come to the state library. Information resources in state library agencies have always included more than books and serials. Documents microforms, newspapers, manuscripts and other forms of recorded information are part of the inventory of a major reference library. And, today, librarians and users find immediate help on the web and in various electronic and digitized sources. Although information formats are changing, the NCES data on traditional library holdings still provide an index to a StLA’s capacity for service, and will do so for some time.

From the NCES “Highlights”- 1999:

- ◆ The number of books and serial volumes held by state library agencies totaled 22.2 million, with New York accounting for the largest collection (2.4 million) (table 10). Six state library agencies had book and serial volumes of over one million. In other states, collections ranged from 500,000 to one million (10 states); 200,000 to 499,999 (13 states); 100,000 to 199,999 (7 states); 50,000 to 99,999 (6 states); and under 50,000 (7 states). ...

The number of serial subscriptions held by state library agencies totaled over 100,000, with New York, California, and Indiana holding the largest number (about 11,000 each) (table 10). Six state library agencies reported serial subscriptions of over 5,000. In other states, these collections ranged from 2,000 to 4,999 (5 states); 1,000 to 1,999 (11 states); 500 to 999 (13 states); 100 to 499 (11 states), and under

The data in Table A-1 tell us:

- New York State Library is the largest of the StLAs with collections of 2.4 million books and serials volumes, and 11,136 serials subscriptions.
- Ten of the StLAs increased the number of their serials subscriptions between 1994 and 1999, with increases ranging from 8 percent to 89 percent.
- The New York and New Jersey State libraries reported the only decrease in serials subscriptions. New York reported a decrease of 7,035 titles; New Jersey, 100 titles.

Table A-1 Size of Collections

State	Books and Serial Volumes FY 1999¹ (a)	Subscriptions FY 1999¹ (and Percent Change Since 1994) (b)	Subscriptions FY 1994² (c)
California	760,276	11,122 (+ 15%)	9,630
Connecticut	1,015,463	10,000 (+ 8 %)	9,273
Florida	342,766	1,439 (+ 89%)	760
Illinois	730,000	4,000 (+ 25%)	3,200
Michigan	1,631,758	5,403 (+ 5%)	4,500
New Jersey	1,900,000	1,900 (- 5 %)	2,000
New York	2,441,437	11,136 (- 39%)	18,171
Ohio	627,309	575 (+ 17 %)	490
Pennsylvania	1,003,967	4,292 (+ 11%)	3,881
Texas	1,175,144	588 (+ 1,370%)	40
Virginia	738,318	980 (+ 18%)	830
Washington	975,698	3,500 (+ 60%)	2,189

¹Source: *State Library Agencies, Fiscal Year 1999*, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 10

²Source: *State Library Agencies, Fiscal Year 1994*, NCES E.D. Tabs, June 1996, Table 7

Staff

Staff is a major resource for the public services and the library development services of a StLA. Table B-1 provides a picture of change in the number of total StLA staff positions over the six-year period, 1994- 1999. It also provides a picture of staff assigned to library services - the people in “the library.”

Library services staff includes both people who work in public services dealing with the library’s customers (such as reference librarians and circulation staff) and those in “technical services.” People in technical services generally work outside the view of the public as they acquire, catalog, and organize books and materials.

Data on staff positions assigned to library development services appear in Table C-1 in Part C of this paper (“What do the StLA Data Tell Us about Library Development and Services?”).

From the NCES “Highlights”- 1999: The total number of budgeted full-time equivalent (FTE) positions in state library agencies was 3,848 (table 13a). Librarians with American Library Association-Master of Library Science (ALA-MLS) degrees accounted for 1,209 of these positions, or 31.4 percent of total FTE positions. Rhode Island reported the largest percentage (55.0 percent) of ALA-MLS librarians, and Virginia reported the smallest (12.7 percent).

Table A-2 reflects the fact that this part of the paper looks at the New York State Library and its counterparts in states with StLA income of \$40 million or more and/or with StLA collections of 600,000 or more volumes.

Data in Table A-2 tell us:

- ◆ Total staff number of staff positions ranges from 252.3 in Virginia to 86.5 in Pennsylvania.
- ◆ Virginia has the largest size staff (252.3), followed by Texas (211.4), California (191), New York (188.8).
- ◆ Between 1994 and 1999, five states lost staff (Florida, New Jersey, New York, Ohio and Washington).
- ◆ Staff assigned to library services (both public and technical services) range from 153.3 in Virginia to 37 in New Jersey.
- ◆ Staff assigned to public services in the libraries range from 78.8 in New York to 18.8 in Illinois.
- ◆ After New York, the four states with the largest public services staff are Virginia (51.5), California (44), Michigan (39), and Pennsylvania (32.5).
- ◆ Technical services staff range from 73.3 in Virginia to 8.8 in Texas.

Table A-2 Staff

State	Staff in Library Services			
	Total StLA Staff 1999 ¹ 1994 ² (a)	Total Library Services Staff (and Percent of Total Staff) ³ FY 1999 (b)	Library Services Staff in Public Services (and Percent of Library Services Staff) ³ FY 1999 (c)	Library Services Staff in Technical Services (and Percent of Library Services Staff) ³ FY 1999 (d)
California	191.0 176.5	83.5 (44%)	44.0 (53%)	34.5 (41%)
Connecticut	120.0 110.0	61.0 (51%)	27.0 (44%)	17.0 (28%)
Florida	120.0 123.0	38.5 (32%)	22.0 (57%)	10.5 (27%)
Illinois	111.8 106.0	45.8 (41%)	18.8 (41%)	10.0 (22%)
Michigan	106.0 101.0	93.5 (88%)	39.0 (42%)	23.0 (25%)
New Jersey	88.0 89.0	37.0 (42%)	30.0 (81%)	7.0 (19%)
New York	188.8 204.0	149.9 (79%)	78.7 (53%)	45.4 (30%)
Ohio	125.0 126.0	83.0 (66%)	29.0 (35%)	21.0 (25%)
Pennsylvania	86.5 84.0	49.0 (57%)	32.5 (66%)	16.5 (34%)
Texas	211.4 207.3	98.1 (46%)	24.9 (25%)	8.8 (9%)
Virginia	252.3 151.0	153.3 (61%)	51.5 (34%)	73.3 (48%)
Washington	132.0 133.0	94.5 (72%)	27.5 (29%)	26.0 (28%)

¹ Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 13a

² Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1994, NCES E.D. Tabs, June 1996, Table 11a

³ Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 13.d

(V) Part B -- What does the NCES StLA Data Tell Us About Electronic Development?

The digital revolution is affecting libraries of all types and all size, from the smallest community and school library to the largest research libraries. It is, of course, changing the way people of all ages use libraries and information. StLAs are taking leadership in helping libraries and people in their states to access digitized information. Access to digitized information is often through the StLA website and it's links with private sector databases. Statewide database licenses benefit users at the library, other libraries in the state, and members of the public who have remote access to the databases.

From the NCES "Highlights" – 1999:

- ◆ State library agencies in 49 states and the District of Columbia plan or monitor electronic network development; 45 of these agencies operate electronic networks; and 46 of these agencies develop network content (i.e., database development) (table 3).
- ◆ Thirty-six state library agencies were applicants to the Universal Service (E-rate discount) Program established by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) under the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (P.L. 104-104) (appendix B).
- ◆ All state library agencies facilitate library access to the Internet in one or more of the following ways: training or consulting library staff in the use of the Internet; providing a subsidy for Internet participation; providing equipment to access the Internet; providing access to directories, databases, or online catalogs; and managing gopher/Web sites, file servers, bulletin boards, or listservs (table 3).
- ◆ Forty-seven state library agencies provide or facilitate library access to on-line databases through subscription, lease, license, consortial membership, or agreement (table 3).
- ◆ Almost all state library agencies facilitate or subsidize electronic access to the holdings of other libraries in their state, most frequently through Online Computer Library Center (OCLC) participation (41 states and the District of Columbia) (table 5). Over half provide access via a Web-based union catalog (30 states) or Telnet gateway (28 states).
- ◆ Forty-eight state library agencies have Internet workstations available for public use, ranging in number from 2 to 4 (22 states); 5 to 9 (13 states); 10 to 19 (5 states); 20 to 29 (5 states); and 30 or more (3 states). Louisiana reported the largest number of public-use Internet terminals (49) (table 4).
- ◆ Forty-seven state library agencies reported combined expenditures of over \$25.4 million for statewide database licensing (table 6a). Of these, Michigan had the highest expenditure (\$3.1 million) and Louisiana the lowest (\$6,000). Over two-thirds of the state library agencies reporting such expenditures provided statewide database licensing services to public, academic, school, and special libraries, and to library cooperatives, with public libraries served most frequently (47 states). Other state agencies and remote users were also served by over two-thirds of the state library agencies reporting such expenditures.

The New York State Library is represented in the “yes” column for each of the services identified in the preceding NCES “Highlights.”

The New York State Library website <www.nysl.nysed.gov> provides detailed information about NOVEL (the New York Online Virtual Electronic Library) and related initiatives and the legislation introduced by Senator Hugh T. Farley and Assemblywoman Naomi Matusow to invest \$95 million in these and other library improvement initiatives).

Data in Table B-1 tell us:

- The numbers of workstations with Internet access available to onsite users ranged from 2 to 40 in 1999.
- New York has fewer such workstations than Connecticut, Michigan, and Pennsylvania.
- The New York State Library, and most of the other libraries listed in Table B-1 report functions relating to each of the topics cited in the NCES ‘Highlights’ on page 9.
- Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania in 1999 used entirely state funds to purchase licenses for the StLA and libraries in their states to access commercial databases, including both indexes and full text.
- Connecticut, Florida, New Jersey, New York, Virginia, and Washington used only Federal funds for such purchases. Michigan and Texas used both State and Federal funds.

**Table B-1 Electronic Capacity and
Statewide Access to Resources FY 1999**

State	Number of Internet Workstations for Public ¹ (a)	Number of Means of Electronic Access to Holdings of Other Libraries ² (b)	Expenditures for Statewide Database Licensing ³ (c)	Percentage of Licensing Expenditures from State and Federal Sources ⁴ State / Federal (d)	
California	2	5	\$ 0	-	-
Connecticut	25	2	131,000	0%	100%
Florida	15	1	43,000	0%	100%
Illinois	12	5	2,110,000	100%	0%
Michigan	40	1	3,097,000	16%	84%
New York	21	6	375,000	0%	100%
New Jersey	8	3	37,000	0%	100%
Ohio	9	3	2,061,000	100%	0%
Pennsylvania	34	4	1,250,000	100%	0%
Texas	3	3	2,181,000	91%	9%
Virginia	5	2	390,000	0%	100%
Washington	9	1	500,000	0%	100%

¹ Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 4

² Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 5

³ Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 6

⁴ Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 6

Part C -- What does the NCES StLA data tell us About Library Development and Services?

[For reasons of brevity, this Part C-section does not include an NCES “Highlights” excerpt. The “Library Development Services” section of the “Highlights” is more than one page of information on StLA services to public, academic, school library media centers, special libraries, and systems. For that text, see pages vi and vii in the NCES StLA Ed. Tabs. for 1999.]

In most states, library development programs have expanded and taken new directions in the last several years. The Federal Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) has caused many StLAs to increase connections with university, school, and special libraries. In more than half of the states, state aid is an important component of public library support and library system development and networking is breaking new ground.

Table C-1 below shows how financial aid to libraries and systems compare in dollars and per capita among New York and the 11 other states. Four columns show data separately for state aid and for total aid from all sources, including Federal funds.

Table C-1 also shows the number of staff members assigned to library development responsibilities.

Because library system membership directly affects local services, Table C-1 includes columns of data on three key measures of public library services - reference questions, circulation, and interlibrary loans. (The data for these services are taken from the NCES *Public Libraries in the United States, FY 1997*. The Table does not include total circulation, reference, and interlibrary loan data from school, academic and special libraries inasmuch as there are not comparable NCES E.D. Tabs for these types of libraries.)

Readers interested in detail on the comprehensiveness of StLA state aid programs are referred to Table 26b in the NCES StLA Ed. Tabs. for 1999. That report provides data on expenditures for state financial assistance to libraries in Table 26b under eight headings. Only New York and Pennsylvania report expenditures under each of the eight headings. Numbers for the other states are: California 4; Connecticut 5; Florida 4; Illinois 7; Massachusetts 6; Michigan 4; New Jersey 4; Ohio 5; Texas 3; Virginia 2; and, Washington 2.

Data in Table C-1 tell us:

- Three states shown in this table provide \$4 or more per capita from state funds for aid to libraries and systems: (New York, \$5.11; Pennsylvania, \$4.52; and, Illinois, \$4.48).
- Six states provide between \$1 and \$2.40 per capita from state funds for aid to libraries and systems: (Michigan, \$2.38; Florida, \$2.30; Virginia, \$2.29; New Jersey, \$1.73; Connecticut, \$1.62; and California, \$1.04).

- Three states provide less than a dollar per capita for state aid: Ohio, Texas, and Washington.
- Seven states have library development staffs numbering between 29 and 19: (California, 29; Connecticut, 28; Pennsylvania, 25; Illinois 25; New York 21.8; Texas 21.3; and, Florida, 19).
- New York public libraries in 1997 reported answering 2.1 reference questions per capita; Florida reported 1.8 per capita; and Illinois 1.5 per capita.
- Illinois public libraries in 1997 reported receiving 1,140,000 interlibrary loans (108 per 1000 of population). New York's public libraries reported receiving 1,492,000 interlibrary loans (89.4 per 1000 of population).
- It is interesting to note that Massachusetts (which is not among the states examined in this paper) reported state aid of \$7.71 per capita and had the highest interlibrary rate (176.0 per 1,000 population).

Table C-1 Library Development Aid and Impact on Three Key Services

State	Financial Aid to Libraries/ Systems from State Sources FY 1999 (in millions) (a)	Per Capita Financial Aid to Libraries/ Systems from State Sources FY 1999 (b)	Financial Aid to Libraries/ Systems From All Sources FY 1999 (in millions) (c)	Per Capita Financial Aid to Libraries/ Systems from All Sources FY 1999 (d)	Library Development Staff Positions FY 1999 (e)	Public Library Reference Questions (in thousands and per capita) FY 1997 (f)	Public Library Circulation (in thousands and per capita) FY 1997 (g)	Public Library Interlibrary Loans Provided (in thousands and per 1,000 pop) FY 1997 (h)	Public Library Interlibrary Loans Received (in thousands and per 1,000 pop) FY 1997 (i)
California	\$34.6	\$1.04	\$46.0	\$1.38	29.0	36,541 (1.1)	159,848 (4.9)	861 (26.4)	631 (19.4)
Connecticut	5.3	1.62	5.8	1.78	28.0	4,159 (1.3)	28,175 (8.6)	222 (67.8)	227 (69.2)
Florida	34.6	2.30	40.1	2.68	19.0	25,051 (1.8)	72,666 (5.1)	155 (10.8)	164 (11.5)
Illinois	47.8	4.48	52.6	4.93	25.0	15,979 (1.5)	82,973 (7.9)	1,133 (107.5)	1,140 (108.2)
Massachusetts	46.9	7.71	49.0	8.05	16.5	(S)	44,966 (7.4)	1,051 (172.5)	1,072 (176.0)
Michigan	22.1	2.38	24.7	2.65	5.0	8,305 (0.9)	50,861 (5.5)	571 (61.5)	596 (64.2)
New Jersey	14.0	1.73	16.1	1.99	9.0	7,834 (1.0)	48,218 (6.1)	349 (44.0)	429 (54.2)
New York	92.0	5.11	96.8	5.38	21.8	34,786 (2.1)	124,078 (7.4)	1,314 (78.8)	1,492 (89.4)
Ohio	8.7	0.78	12.7	1.13	16.0	15,994 (1.4)	140,821 (12.6)	677 (60.6)	806 (72.0)
Pennsylvania	53.7	4.52	57.2	4.81	25.0	7,097 (0.6)	54,613 (4.7)	363 (31.2)	312 (26.8)
Texas	4.4	0.23	12.5	0.65	21.3	17,726 (1.0)	77,104 (4.4)	191 (10.8)	234 (13.3)
Virginia	15.5	2.29	15.8	2.33	9.0	6,426 (1.0)	50,417 (7.6)	65 (9.8)	79 (11.8)
Washington	0.9	0.16	2.5	0.45	11.5	(S)	54,910 (10.2)	150 (27.8)	153 (28.3)

Suppressed Data – low response

(V) Part D -- What does the NCES StLA Data Tell Us About Income and Expenditures

From the NCES StLA “Highlights” –1999:

Income

- ◆ State library agencies reported a total income of \$949.0 million in FY 1999 (83.7 percent from state sources, 14.5 percent from federal sources, and 1.8 percent from other sources) (table 16).
- ◆ State library agency income from state sources totaled \$794.3 million, with 69.4 percent (\$551 million) designated for state aid to libraries (table 18). In 11 states, over 75 percent of income from state sources was designated for state aid to libraries, with Massachusetts having the largest percentage (96.2 percent). Seven states (Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming) and the District of Columbia targeted no state funds for aid to libraries.
- ◆ Federal income totaled \$137.5 million, with 87.1 percent from the Library Services and Technology Act (LSTA) (table 17).

Expenditures

- ◆ State library agencies reported total expenditures of \$949.6 million in FY 1999 (table 19). The largest percentage (83.6 percent) was from state funds, followed by federal funds (14.8 percent), and other funds (1.7 percent).
- ◆ In five states, over 90 percent of total expenditures were from state sources (table 19). These states were Massachusetts (94.0 percent), Maryland (92.5 percent), New York (92.3 percent), Pennsylvania (90.7 percent), and Georgia (90.4 percent). The District of Columbia had the smallest percentage of expenditures from state sources (49.4 percent), followed by Utah (57.8 percent).

Table D-1 tells us:

- Total income from state resources (of which state aid is a major component) increased in every state except Illinois in the 1994-1999 period.
- Increases in total income ranged from 23 percent to 98 percent over the six-year period.
- Only Illinois had a reduction of total income from state sources.
- Expenditures from all resources for operation increased in every state except New York in the 1994-1999 period.
- Expenditure increases for operation ranged from 5 percent to 195 percent over the six-year period.
- Expenditures for operation in some cases doubled or tripled, New York operated in 1999 on two percent less than it had expended in 1994. Over the same period, New York State budget for operating state departments overall increased 15 percent.
- New York State is the only state that operated in 1999 on less than it did in 1994.

Note that Table D-1 includes two sets of data. The first two columns report and compare “Total Income From State Sources” in 1999 and 1994 - these income figures include major appropriations for state financial assistance to libraries/library systems.

The columns (c) & (d) in Table-D1 report and compare “Total Expenditures From All Sources in 1999 and 1994 for operation of the StLA. These expenditures include expenditures for operation of both library and library development services.

“Expenditures from all Sources for Operation” is used for a measure of change in the expenditures for running the StLAs. The appearance of the new Federal LSTA program to replace LSCA caused major shifts in program and tradeoffs in Federal and State funds for some state libraries.

Table D-1. Income and Expenditure, FY 1999 and FY 1994

State	Total Income From State Sources¹ FY 1999 (in millions) (and percent change since 1994) (a)	Total Income from State Sources² FY 1994 (in millions) (b)	Expenditures from all Sources for Operation³ FY 1999 (in millions) (and percent change since 1994) (c)	Expenditures From all Sources for Operation⁴ FY 1994 (in millions) (d)
California	\$ 48.6 (+48%)	\$ 32.8	\$ 17.3 (+33%)	\$ 13.0
Connecticut	16.1 (+63%)	9.9	14.4 (+106%)	7.0
Florida	45.9 (+42%)	32.3	8.8 (+24%)	7.1
Illinois	66.6 (-8%)	72.7	6.6 (+16%)	5.7
Michigan	33.0 (+23%)	26.9	11.2 (+56%)	7.2
New Jersey	21.3 (+28%)	16.6	6.4 (+60%)	4.0
New York	100.4 (+24%)	81.2	11.2 (-2 %)	11.4
Ohio	15.8 (+98%)	8.0	8.4 (+5 %)	8.0
Pennsylvania	63.1 (+56%)	40.4	12.4 (+195%)	4.2
Texas	14.7 (+34%)	11.0	12.8 (+94%)	6.6
Virginia	27.6 (+70%)	16.2	16.0 (+100%)	8.0
Washington	7.8 (+39%)	5.6	8.1 (+31%)	6.2

¹Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 16

²Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 20

³Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1994, NCES, E.D. Tabs, June 1996, Table 16

⁴Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1994, NCES, E.D. Tabs, June 1996, Table 18

(V) Part E -- What does NCES StLA Data Tell Us about Governance?

Decisions on governance of a state library agency are political decisions that likely take into account varying perceptions of the state's need for libraries and differing expectations.

The earlier sections of this paper looked at the New York State Library in its context as one of the largest and most comprehensive StLAs in the nation and compared it with several other states with large state libraries.

This section looks at:

- (1) The locations of StLAs in the nation as described in the "NCES Highlights" section below.
- (2) Placement of the some two-thirds of the StLAs located within various Executive Branch departments.
- (3) Data on StLAs in state departments that center on cultural purposes.

Comparison of data on services, resources, programs, income, and expenditures in this group of StLAs in state departments centering on cultural purposes in Table with the larger group of StLAs in Parts A-D of this Working Paper may raise additional questions and expectations for a possible change in governance of the New York State Library.

In addition, this section includes background on the context for this Working Paper and information on the governing structure of the New York State Library and the Office of Cultural Education in the State Education Department..

From the NCES "Highlights"- 1999:

Nearly all state library agencies (47 states and the District of Columbia) are located in the executive branch of government. Of these, almost two-thirds are part of a larger agency, most commonly the state department of education. In three states (Arizona, Michigan, and Tennessee), the agency is located in the legislative branch.

Data in Tables E-1 and E-2 tell us:

- Four StLAs are part of a state "Department of Cultural Resources." They are Louisiana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and North Carolina.
- The "Other" column in Table E-1 identifies three StLAs that are located in Departments whose names include the words *arts*, *museum*, and *cultural affairs*: Kentucky, Nevada, and South Dakota.
- The "Other" column in Table E-1 also identifies five StLAs located in Departments whose names include the words *education*, *regents*, or *college*: Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, New Jersey, and South Dakota.

Note that the "Highlights" text above identifies the states in which the StLA is located in the Legislative branch: Arizona, Michigan, and Tennessee.

Table E-1 Location of StLAs Part of a Larger Agency

Department of Education (a)	Department of Cultural Resources (b)	Department of State (c)	Other (d)
Alaska	Louisiana	Delaware	Georgia: transferred to Board of Regents fin 2000 from Technical and Adult Education Department;
Arkansas	New Hampshire	Florida	Idaho: Office of the State Board of Education
Colorado	New Mexico	Illinois	Kentucky: Education, Arts & Humanities Cabinet
Connecticut	North. Carolina	Missouri	Minnesota: Department of Children Families & Learning
Hawaii			Nevada: Department of Museums, Library & Arts
Iowa			New Jersey: Thomas Edison State College
Maryland			Rhode Island: Department of Administration
New York			South Dakota: Education & Cultural Affairs Department
North Dakota			Utah: Community & Economic Development Department
Pennsylvania			Vermont: Agency of Administration
Virginia			Wyoming: Department of Administration & Information
Wisconsin			

**Table E-2 Characteristics of StLAs in Cultural Departments
Compared with New York State Library**

Expenditures					Staff			Collections	
State	Financial Aid to Libraries/ Systems from State Sources FY 1999 ¹ (dollars) (a)	Per Capita Financial Aid to Libraries/ Systems from State Sources ² FY 1999 (b)	Total Expenditures from All Sources FY 1999 ³ (dollars) (c)	Total Operating Expenditures FY 1999 ⁴ (d)	Total Staff Positions ⁵ (e)	Library Development Staff Positions (and percent of total staff) (f)	Library Services Staff Positions (and percent of total staff) (g)	Collections Book and Serial Volumes ⁸ (h)	Collections Subscriptions (i)
Louisiana	\$1,500,000	\$ 0.34	\$ 8,155,000	\$6,655,000	81.0	8.0 (10%)	63.0 (78%)	466,715	1,104
Nevada	1,119,000	0.63	6,445,000	3,963,000	49.0	8.5 (17%)	17.0 (35%)	59,297	483
New Hampshire	80,000	0.07	2,791,000	2,502,000	48.6	5.6 (12%)	38.3 (79%)	530,827	290
New Mexico	355,000	0.21	4,413,000	4,008,000	65.0	6.0 (9%)	50.0 (77%)	300,000	700
New York	92,019,000	5.11	107,952,000	11,168,000	188.8	21.8 (12%)	149.9 (79%)	2,441,437	11,136
North Carolina	17,962,000	2.42	27,261,000	6,548,000	92.0	13.0 (14%)	70.5 (77%)	164,014	720
South Dakota	5,000	0.01	2,272,000	1,898,000	33.3	2.7 (8%)	25.9 (78%)	251,712	899

¹Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 26b

²Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 26f

³Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 24

⁴Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 24

⁵Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 13b

⁶Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 13c

⁷Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 10

⁸Source: *State Library Agencies*, 1999, NCES E.D. Tabs, September 2000, Table 10

Context for the Information Provided in Earlier Parts of this Working Paper and its Application to New York State

The StLA Steering Committee identified the following questions in 1997, and reviewed them in 1999 in its discussions of “Public Policy Interest in State Library Agencies and Use of StLA Data”

- ✓ **What significance is there in the location of a StLA in its state government? How do location in the executive or legislative branch or status as an independent board/commission affect the size, scope, operations, performance, and level of support of a StLA?**
- ✓ **Does a specific StLA carry out its functions efficiently as compared with the other StLAs or groups of StLAs?**
- ✓ **How do salaries for StLA personnel compare with others?**

The extent to which the data in this Working Paper can be useful for public policy research depends upon (1) how the policy researcher frames specific questions and (2) the purpose of the research. The data are useful for comparisons suggested by the StLA Steering Committee’s second question. The StLA survey reports data on salary expenditures, but not individual salaries or levels of salaries; therefore this Working Paper is silent on the third question.

The excerpts from the Governor’s proposal that appear on pages 2-4 of this Working Paper suggest two purposes for transferring the State Library from the Board of Regents:

- ◆ to promote recognition and visibility of the State Library and the State Archives... *[see page 2 for the three bullets amplifying this purpose]*
- ◆ to sharpen the focus of the Board of Regents on matters directly related to education and to streamline agency operations (p.3).

In Summary – What Do the Data Say that Relates to Governance of the New York State Library?

The data in this Working Paper indicate strengths of the New York State Library’s collections, staff, electronic capacity, and library development services¹. In several instances or aspects of these characteristics, the New York State Library ranks first among the states examined. In other instances, there are some surprising deviations, sometimes affected by the New York State Library’s income and expenditure capacity over the six-year period.

¹ The StLA Ed. Tabs. includes additional data on resources and service outputs not examined in this Working Paper.

Over the six-year period, each of the StLAs, including New York, reported growth of total income (including state aid). However, for the most part, there are differences in rate of growth of income designated for state aid and that designated for agency operation.

The most telling and worrisome finding is that the New York State Library reported a decrease in expenditures for agency operations, while the other states reported increased expenditures for agency operation ranging from 16 percent to 195 percent above their 1994 expenditure level. The New York State Library is the only state library to have operated in 1999 on less than it had expended in 1994.

The State Library is now part of the State Education Department's Office of Cultural Education. The State Library, the State Archives, the State Library, and Educational Television comprise the Office of Cultural Education.

If the Library, Archives, Museum and Educational Television/Public Broadcasting were transferred from the State Education Department to the proposed Office of Cultural Resources, some 409 staff, some \$17 million in operating funds, some \$92 million in state aid for libraries, and the LSTA funds would be added to the Council on the Arts and its staff of 64 positions cited in the excerpt from the 2000-01 budget.

Background on the Governing Structure of the New York State Library

The New York State Library was established by the Legislature in 1818. Its statute provided for "a public Library for the government and people of the State" to be governed by a Board consisting of the Governor and other *ex-officio* members.

An 1844 law established the Regents of the University of the State of New York as trustees of the State Library. The Board of Regents had been established in 1784 as a corporation empowered to act as trustees of Columbia College (originally chartered as King's College in 1754 and closed during the Revolution).

The scope of the "University" expanded significantly in the late 19th century when Melvil Dewey, as State Librarian and Secretary to the Board of Regents, led the Regents to endorse public libraries as educational institutions. The "Education Unification Act" of 1905 re-defined the nature of the University and established the State Education Department under the Regents.

Today, the University of the State of New York encompasses more than 10,000 educational institutions. It includes public, independent and proprietary colleges and universities, 38 licensed professions, archives, museums, and libraries, public and nonpublic schools, vocational rehabilitation networks, and public television.

The Regents are elected by the Legislature in joint session. The Regents appoint a Commissioner of Education, who is also the President of the University.

A Deputy Commissioner for Cultural Education has responsibility for the State Library, State Archives, and Public Television, and heads the Office of Cultural Education.

The State Librarian also holds the title of Assistant Commissioner for Libraries. The Commissioner of Education, with the approval of Regents appoints Deputy and Assistant Commissioners.

Another Look at Table E-1

The presentation in Table E-1 of this paper brings a different perspective on location of StLAs than one gets from the governance tables in the *NCES Ed.Tabs*. Column (d) in E-1 is striking because it recalls observations by political scientists and scholars from the mid-20th century. Their research studies both analyzed and advanced the rapid expansion of StLA roles, resources and expectations. (And their work also had much to do with StLA advances over the last four decades.)

As an example, pages 400-411 of a 1969 compendium of papers titled *Libraries at Large: Tradition, Innovation, and The National Interest*² comments thus in a discussion of StLA location with education departments:

“Being relatively small departments of state government, state libraries tend inevitably to be absorbed in reorganization into larger agencies. Although most state libraries still function as relatively independent agencies, there does seem to be a trend toward grouping them with departments of education.

“If there is such a trend, is it desirable? To the extent that state government reorganization creates a department of education that has responsibility for the coordination of all levels of education, including higher education and adult education, then this department can be viewed as one of the logical units within which to locate the comprehensive state library.” This statement is footnoted as follows (p.404): “Even within a broadly conceived education department, a high degree of independence for library functions must be maintained to assure that the library needs are not submerged by the pressing non-library demands of schools and colleges. Alternatives to incorporation into a comprehensive department of education would include grouping the state library with a cultural affairs department or with an information processing agency.”

² *Libraries at Large: Tradition, Innovation, and The National Interest; The Resource Book Based on the Materials of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries*” edited by Douglas M. Knight and E. Shepley Nourse. New York R.R. Bowker, 1969.

Interesting! Changes in the locations of StLAs over recent decades have resulted in a Table E-1 that looks quite different from what a researcher might have prepared in 1969!

Barratt Wilkins' observation in recent paper, "The Art of State Librarianship,"³ provides a brief, but fairly comprehensive discussion of the placement of StLAs within state government and raises a question:

"...Is there a best place? Many would argue that state library agencies in state departments of education are often lost in the bureaucracy, particularly compared with other components of higher education, public schools, and vocational and technical education. Independent state library agencies under a board or commission appointed by a Governor tend to have the most independence in policy and library development, but that depends on the interest and strength of the Governor. Those attached to other state departments seem to fare well, because they come into daily mix with many disparate functions of government; thus library and information services is seen in a different context than simply attached to education. The record of legislative control of the state library agency is mixed – well supported in one state and comparatively not so well in the other."

VI Questions for the StLA Steering Committee Discussion

1. What is the chief public policy question raised by the Governor' proposal?
2. How might we and COSLA stimulate research that addresses the first of our 1997/1999 governance questions relating to the significance of the location of a StLA in its state government?
3. In the light of this working paper, what other questions might replace, improve upon, or be more useful in our compilation of questions regarding governance
4. Also, in the light of this paper, what other StLA survey questions should be consider so as to have data useful for public policy questions in the area of governance?

³ pp. 78-81 in *The Functions and Roles of State Library Agencies*, compiled by Ethel E. Himmel and William J. Wilson, edited by GraceAnne A. DeCandido in Cooperation with the Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Services and the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies. Chicago, ALA/ASCLA, 2000.

Acknowledgement

I greatly appreciate the help of these people who read and commented on early drafts, made suggestions, raised questions, and/or helped edit, format and compute data: Patti Chandler, Virginia Camerman, Marion Crounse, Denise Davis, Maria Hazapis, Elaine Kroe, Mary Redmond, and David Smingler. This paper could not have been completed without their help. Nevertheless, the responsibility for errors and omissions is entirely mine.

--Joseph F. Shubert, Chair of the StLA Steering Committee.

List of Tables with Page Numbers	
Table	Page Number
A-1 Size of Collections.....	7
A-2 Staff.....	9
B-1 Electronic Capacity and Statewide Access to Resources, FY 1999.....	12
C-1 Library Development Aid and Impact on Three Key Services.....	15
D-1 Income and Expenditure, FY 1999 and FY 1994.....	18
E-1 Location of StLAsPart of a Larger Agency.....	20
E-2 Characteristics of StLAs in Cultural Departments Compared with New York State Library.....	21